

CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSED REVISIONS

Chapter 4 presents a summary of general conclusions and identifies needed actions and/or proposed plan amendments to address or implement identified changes as discussed in Chapters 1 through 3 of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). This Chapter provides only a summary; should additional information be desired, the reader should consult the full discussion of the respective issue, element or special topic.

Proposed revisions may include the identification of new and revised goals, objectives and policies, revised future condition maps, capital improvement schedules, and monitoring and evaluation procedures. While actual proposed amendment language is not included, the general nature or types of changes are clearly described. All proposed revisions presented here have been carefully linked to the evaluation of current conditions within the County, objective achievement, issues, problems and opportunities, and other sections of the report.

4.1 CDMP MAJOR ISSUES

4.1.1 CDMP Time Horizons and UDB Capacity and Expansion

Conclusions

The issue of Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) time horizons and Urban Development Boundary (UDB) capacity and expansion impacts both the Land Use Plan (LUP) map and all the elements of the CDMP. The time horizons of the CDMP are currently the near-term year 2005 and the long-term year 2015. These horizons are reflected on the LUP map as the 2005 UDB and the 2015 Urban Expansion Area (UEA) boundary.

The Department is recommending that the planning horizons for the CDMP be updated to year 2015 for the near term and UDB and to year 2025 for the long term and UEA boundary. Because of the lead time necessary to plan, finance, permit and develop public facilities as well as private development, it is desirable that the Plan's time horizons be adjusted so that the near-term horizon will be approximately 5 years or more beyond the date that the next EAR (2010) will be prepared. Similarly, because of the extended time periods required to plan and build such public facilities as transportation, public water supplies and wastewater treatment facilities, the year 2025 is warranted as a long-range horizon.

The area within the UDB provides enough countywide development capacity of residential land to accommodate projected development until 2020, which gives the County an overall capacity of 17 years. Land Use Policy 8G calls for the UDB to contain a ten-year supply of developable land having capacity to sustain projected countywide residential demand for a period of ten years after adoption of the most recent EAR plus a 5-year surplus (a total of 15-year countywide supply beyond the EAR adoption date). On a Countywide basis, there is no need to expand the UDB.

The capacity to sustain projected residential demand for 15 years is an issue for two of the four planning tiers in the County, South Central Miami-Dade and North Miami-Dade. The Department, however, is not recommending that the UDB be expanded in these areas at this time. Currently, the depletion year for residential land in South Central Miami-Dade is 2016. The depletion year for the western portion of this tier is 2008. As indicated in the introduction to this issue, any consideration of expanding the UDB south of Tamiami Trail should be delayed until the Agriculture and Rural Area Study and the South Miami-Dade Watershed Plan are completed and their recommendations have been developed and considered by the Board of County Commissioners. These planning studies can have a significant impact on the both the selection of planning timeframes and the UDB capacity analysis. The 2003 EAR would result in EAR-based plan amendments that are in compliance with statutory requirements and address the other agreed upon major issues. Additional follow up amendments will be prepared in 2005 at the conclusion of the Watershed planning effort.

The North-Miami Dade Tier, which has an estimated depletion year of 2013, has only one location outside the Lake Belt area where an UDB expansion could be considered for residential development. This location, the area bounded by NW 97 Avenue, NW 170 Street and the

Homestead Extension to the Florida Turnpike, is the site of the former Lakes of the North CDMP amendment application filed in 2000, which was not adopted. An active limestone mining operation is currently ongoing on the land immediately to the west of the subject area. The noise and vibration resulting from blasting associated with limestone mining poses compatibility problems with residential development if the two uses occur too close to one another. Thus, the Department is not recommending an expansion of the UDB in the North-Miami Dade Tier at this time.

The County can, however, take action at this time to encourage compact development, which will reduce the pressure to expand the UDB and support efforts to restore the Everglades. The passage by the voters of the initiative for the People's Transportation Plan on November 5, 2002 not only presents an opportunity to improve public transportation but also presents an opportunity to address the issue of compact development. The development patterns of metropolitan areas are influenced by the modes of transportation available. The plan proposes to expand Metrorail by 88.9 miles, double the County's bus fleet, and relieve traffic congestion through major road improvements.

The specific recommendations for this issue and related issues are the following:

1. The designation of an area as an urban center indicates that governmental agencies encourage and support such development. The County will give special emphasis to providing a high level of public mass transit service to all planned urban centers. Given the high degree of accessibility as well as other urban services, the current text of the plan encourages the intensification of development at these centers over time. Uses in Urban Centers may include retail trade, business, professional and financial services, restaurants, hotels, institutional, recreational, cultural and entertainment uses, moderate to high density residential uses, and well planned public spaces. Incorporation of residential uses is encouraged, and may be approved, in all centers, except where incompatible with airport or heavy industrial activities. Community-scale Urban Centers will be planned and designed to serve a localized community.

A total of eleven additional Community Urban Centers should be designated on the LUP map. General locations have been identified for eight stations on the proposed north Metrorail corridor along NW 27 Avenue between NW 79 Street and the Florida Turnpike. Community Urban Centers should be centered on all eight station locations. A Community Urban Center should be located in Florida City at the southern terminus of the Busway extension. The southwest corner of SW 88 Street and SW 157 Avenue should be the focal point for another Community Urban Center. This site, the location of the proposed Kendall Town Center, will include a transit facility. Another Community Urban Center can be centered on the site of Midway Mall at Palmetto Expressway and Flagler Street. This site, which includes a bus transfer center, has nearby commercial land that could be more intensely developed.

2. The Metropolitan Urban Center that is located adjacent to the Miami International Airport at NW 42 Avenue should be moved east on the LUP map to the site of the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC). The MIC is an excellent location to promote intensification of

development since the people mover to the airport and two commuter rail lines, Metrorail and Tri-Rail, will serve the area. Re-designate the Civic Center Community Urban Center as a Metropolitan Urban Center. Metropolitan Urban Centers accommodate a concentration and variety of uses, which will attract large numbers of both employees and visitors.

3. Miami-Dade County should partner with the Metropolitan Planning Organization and affected municipalities to establish a systematic program that will produce transit-oriented development (TOD) plans for the areas within $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile around all Metrorail and South Dade Busway stations. A phasing program should be established to initiate and formulate updated or new station area plans. A similar process was used in the late 1970's and early 1980's to produce the Station Area Design & Development Plans as the Metrorail was being planned. New station plans should be considered for the new Palmetto Station area and the MIC area. Once the general locations of new station areas have been identified, plans for developing the areas around new stations should be considered. The phasing priorities should be based on such conditions as locations and amounts of undeveloped and underutilized land providing development and redevelopment opportunities, ownership, land use patterns, infrastructure and service levels, recent and nearby development activity, and expressions of interest in cooperating by the municipalities. In addition the review should identify regulatory reforms that would invite, and not impede, transit-oriented development in the station areas. The source of this recommended suggestion is Recommendation No. 1 in the *Residential Density Feasibility Study* that was prepared in 2001 by the Department.
4. The CDMP Guidelines for Urban Form currently recommend that, within the expansive residential areas of the County, higher residential densities should occur in "activity nodes" and in the transition areas around these nodes. However, the CDMP language does not provide sufficient flexibility in the Low-Density category to readily permit dwelling types other than single-family detached dwellings. The Land Use Plan interpretative text is recommended to be modified to allow approval of up to 10 dwelling units per acre in these areas, coupled with any other adjustment to the Guidelines that may warrant clarification. The source of this recommended suggestion is Recommendation No. 2 in the *Residential Density Feasibility Study*.
5. If the County expects to attain public acceptance for compact development, it is going to have to address infrastructure needs and other noted citizen concerns. The County should focus on implementing measures and programs to achieve higher densities in areas that already have the appropriate land use designation on the LUP map. A comprehensive planning program is needed that emulates the successful Smart Growth efforts of other major metropolitan areas. Smart growth is an approach to focusing development in areas where it will build community, protect environmental amenities, promote fiscal health and help keep taxes low. The County is already using some of the tools of Smart Growth such as the urban services boundary (the UDB) and preservation of critical environmental areas and open spaces. A study is recommended that will review the various smart growth programs being adopted in other states and regions and identify specific enhancements that should be considered for adoption into County policies, plans and

programs to effect greater efficiencies in the utilization of its land, environmental and fiscal resources, while continuing to promote the qualities of life desired. Among other “smart growth” strategies, consideration should be given to: a) further focus infrastructure and service resources toward improving conditions in currently developed areas and areas recommended on the LUP map for increased density; b) identify areas where further streamlining of regulations and procedures can help expedite permitting; and c) create incentives for municipalities to promote compatible densification and intensification of development. The source of this recommended suggestion is Recommendation No. 6 in the *Residential Density Feasibility Study*.

6. A density incentive for good urban design needs to be developed for properties with the land use classification of “Medium-High Density Residential Community.” The maximum density permitted in unincorporated areas outside of Urban Centers by the Zoning Code is 50 units per net acre. The residential land use category compatible with this density is Medium-High Density Residential Community.” The current approach in the CDMP of granting for good urban design a one-density increase or a two-density increase in land use classification on a property is not viable for properties already at the maximum density permitted, excluding Urban Centers, for unincorporated Miami-Dade County. The text needs to be rewritten to provide a density bonus to encourage good urban design for properties with a Medium-High Density designation.
7. A mixed-use residential land use classification should be added to the Land Use Plan (LUP) map and the Land Use Plan Interpretative Text. The mixed-use residential classification will facilitate the development of walkable and transit-supportive neighborhoods and corridors. A mixed-use residential category will provide the flexibility to create places that are diverse, sociable and reflective of business and technology. The charrettes that the County has prepared with the public for Metropolitan and Community Urban Centers are designating areas for mixed use. This designation will also improve the compatibility between the LUP map and the municipal plans such as the one for South Miami that already have this type of land use designations.
8. The Land Use Plan Interpretative Text needs to be revised to permit under certain conditions in areas designated as “Industrial and Office” or “Business and Office” live/work and work/live spaces such as lofts for artists and small business owners. This revision is in keeping with the national trend for renovating existing commercial or industrial structures to create lofts. These types of land use configurations do offer residents the advantage of little or no commuting to work. A live/work space is predominately residential with commercial activity as a secondary use. A work/live space is primarily commercial or industrial work activity with residential activity as a secondary use. Guidelines should be developed for locating live/work or work/live areas so that adverse impacts can be minimized to both residents and businesses. Additional guidelines can address such concerns as identifying appropriate uses for live/work or work/live areas and provide measures to prevent mixed-use structures from eventually being used for purely residential purposes, which has been a problem in cities with loft developments in industrial areas.

9. A policy or policies linking land use and access management should be added under Objective 9 of the Land Use Element for internal consistency with the Traffic Circulation Subelement.
10. The depletion year for industrial land may occur much sooner than projected due to the tendency to use industrially designated land for other purposes. As mentioned in the section on commercial land, only 39 percent of a large sample of vacant industrially zoned acres in 1985 remained either vacant industrial or in industrial use in 2000. If this trend were to continue with currently designated industrial land, the countywide depletion year will be 2008 instead of the currently projected year of 2020.

The Interpretative Text of the Land Use Element needs to be revised to address this concern with the conversion of vacant industrial land for other purposes. The commercial uses that could be permitted in areas designated as Industrial and Office on the LUP map should be identified or criteria or standards need to be developed for identifying such uses. A requirement to demonstrate that significant industrial capacity in the area will remain needs to be developed for applicants seeking to convert vacant industrially designated land to a commercial or residential use.

11. Several revisions are needed to insure that the adopted portions of the CDMP are compatible with the objectives of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) and other environmental studies. Objective 3 and Policy 3C in the Land Use Element, which address development activities and the protection of natural resources and system, need to be updated to reflect CERP and other current environmental programs. Land Use Policy 8H, which identifies areas not to be considered for UDB expansion, should be revised to include CERP areas. Revisions to such sections or subsections as Open Land Subareas, Environmental Protection Subareas, and Agricultural Subarea 1 and Future Natural Resources are needed in the Land Use Plan Interpretative Text to insure compatibility. A Public Lands Acquisition Map should be created that depicts the proposed acquisition areas of CERP and other environmental programs. Figures 4 (Open Lands Subareas) and 5 (Environmental Protection Subareas) should be revised. In the Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element, a new policy should be added to encourage consistency between CERP objectives and requested wetland alteration projects.

4.1.2 The Need and Potential for Redevelopment

Conclusions

For a number of years, the need for some estimate of the redevelopment contribution to new housing and commercial capacity was recognized. However, it was not until the advent of this latest EAR cycle that the commitment was made to develop a method for making such estimates. After doing so, and applying it, the conclusion is that it appears to be a reasonable approach to meeting the aforementioned need. But, this statement comes with some important qualifiers.

First, although the method of necessity is applied to individual parcels, the potentials should be considered in terms of areas. Without careful fieldwork and detailed examination and assessment of numerous variables, it is virtually impossible to predict with certainty if and when a given property will be ripe for redevelopment, and even if it is ripe will a developer appear who is ready to accept the risk. Second, the substantial additions to the supply of housing and commercial square feet will likely not come about without appropriate governmental actions to support them. These actions run the gamut from simply fast tracking the permitting process to giving various types of direct aid. Each redevelopment project may be unique with regard to the mix of elements required to make it feasible. Third, the quantities set forth herein should be considered as potentials at “buildout.” It is not possible to put a specific time schedule in place with this hypothetical process. But, it is fair to say that some of this potential, perhaps a lot of it, would probably not be on the ground until at least twenty years from now. Fourth, even though exact numbers are reported as the potentials, they should be viewed as a point in a range of possibilities. A good term to apply might be “representative” of possible outcomes. Finally, the method needs further testing and refinement in the months to come.

The above applies to the technical method which has been devised to estimate redevelopment potentials. Before addressing the subject of policies and actions that might be taken to help achieve redevelopment, a few conclusions about the process in general are in order.

Redevelopment is typically more difficult and risky than new development on the fringe. This situation has been well documented, thus the degree of reliance on the market to generate the scale of redevelopment expected cannot be as high as would be the case with development on virgin land. What this means is that the public sector absolutely must be a player in the high stakes game of redevelopment. The role will vary depending on the project, but the public sector must bring to the table additional, real resources. It was stated in the Residential Density Feasibility Study:

“While a countywide vision including additional housing at higher density is laudable, it is not highly feasible if pursued out of context with the related requirements.”

This statement applies equally to redevelopment – or more so. New programs, elaborate plans, proclamations and exhortations are all well and good, but resource commitment and follow through are essential. As was noted in an earlier section, there is a plethora of redevelopment

type programs in Miami-Dade County, but with the exception of three or four of the Community Redevelopment Areas, and the Downtown Development Authority to some extent, there has not been conspicuous success in achieving the goals of these initiatives. Again, the Residential Density Feasibility Study observes that instead of approaching solutions to problems singly, effectiveness will be enhanced "...if they are part of a larger strategy to promote infill development and redevelopment." The Eastward Ho! initiative supports this approach and has probably been successful in elevating public awareness of the benefits of redevelopment and the need for more of it, but whether the rate of this type activity has increased is problematical. Of course, this is not a tightly structured, action-oriented effort, but more of a promotional and information campaign. The Miami-Dade Department of Planning and Zoning has met with success in the Downtown Kendall Plan which is coming to fruition. It also promotes redevelopment through the charrette process and several have been held. Naranja, Goulds, and Princeton which contain designated urban centers along the South Dade Busway seem to have potential given expected growth along this corridor.

Finally, before discussing some steps that can be taken in the context of the CDMP, it would be well to consider this. Despite the substantial potential contribution that infill and redevelopment in the UIA Study Area can make to growth capacity, simply raising the average density of all development throughout the County, very quickly can exceed these amounts. For example, on a square mile of land, if the net residential density is raised from 4.5 units/acre to 6 units/acre, the total units increase by 720. Thus, continuing to be cautious about moving the UDB and modestly increasing densities can make an enormous difference in the supply of housing units and commercial space. This method should be pursued along with more redevelopment.

Proposed Revisions

The following revisions to the CDMP will advance the provision of redevelopment and infill. Unless an existing objective or policy is mentioned, it can be assumed that these suggestions will lead to new objectives and/or policies in the appropriate element.

1. Redevelopment and infill must be given much more prominence in the CDMP. At least one objective should be added for each.
2. The Department of Planning & Zoning should move forward immediately to formulate appropriate policies to implement Recommendations 1, 2, 4 and 6 in the Residential Density Feasibility Study. The same could apply to Recommendation 5, which is also in the Proposed Economic Element and could advance to implementation more rapidly through that mechanism.
3. After careful review the CDMP should support selected Cornerstone Recommendations of the Infill Strategy Task Force (ISTF).
4. A policy should be placed in the CDMP that recommends, under the auspices of the Assistant County Manager for Economic Development and Housing, that an advisory group be assembled to formulate specific action steps to create and, if approved by the BCC, to implement a comprehensive redevelopment/infill program. The policy

should indicate membership of the group, including municipalities, the purpose and the timeline for completion.

Other Proposed Actions

1. Also, the Additional Recommendations of the ISTF should be carefully reviewed in an expedited manner to determine which ones should be incorporated into the CDMP or dealt with in some other manner.
2. Likewise, the recommendation in the 1999 Final Report of the Brownfields Task Force should be closely reviewed to determine which ones, if any, would be generally applicable to redevelopment.
3. Research to refine the method for identifying redevelopment possibilities should continue in earnest over at least the next year. One of the first things to be done is to validate the model so that it achieves at least a 50 percent probability level for predictability. Once that is done, the option of applying it to other areas beyond the UIA should be investigated.

4.1.3 Annexation and Incorporation: Control of Areawide Planning Functions

Conclusions

As noted in Section 1.3, the County has the authority to control growth over functions of areawide concern even in municipal areas. However, with few exceptions such as the Rapid Transit Zone and the Landscape Ordinance, the authority has not been invoked. Typically, once a new municipality is incorporated and adopts its own Master Plan and zoning code, the County no longer plays a role in future development or regulating land development within the municipal boundaries. As alluded to in the discussion of the issue, this state of affairs worked rather well, for the most part, for many years. However, the current and likely future conditions with respect to the five factors initially identified, point to the need to modify the status quo.

Proposed Revisions

Some ways the County can accomplish retaining control of areawide functions through the CDMP are suggested below.

Urban Development Boundary

1. Section 2-116.1.2 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, which deals with applicability of the CDMP to municipalities, should be rigorously applied.
2. The Population Estimates and Projections map should be adopted as a coordinating element of plans produced not only by all County agencies, but also all municipalities.
3. All incorporation and annexation proposals beyond the UDB should be subject to Sec. 2-116.1.2(b) of the Code of Miami-Dade County.

Urban Centers

1. The Urban Center development guidelines should be adopted as minimum standards for development in CDMP-designated Urban Centers, countywide. At a minimum, these standards should apply to any designated Urban Center containing a Metrorail station.
2. A joint county/city planning board or similar entity should be formed to deal with instances in which the minimum development standards for Urban Centers in the CDMP cannot be met.
3. Development in municipalities at or above the CDMP minimum standards for intensity in Urban Centers must be located such that they will not compete with Urban Centers at transit stations.

Facilities of Countywide Impact

1. The County should adopt policies in the CDMP and Ordinances retaining the ability of the County to site necessary public or semi-public facilities countywide, and to reserve rights of way and plan and construct planned transportation facilities.
2. A list of facilities of countywide impact should be prepared and placed in the CDMP. The County should adopt policies in the CDMP and Ordinances requiring review and/or approval by the County of land uses adjacent to those public facilities as listed in the CDMP.
3. Areas designated Transportation on the Future Land Use Plan map, representing the major components of Miami-Dade's existing and future transportation system shall not be annexed or incorporated into municipalities, or alternatively the County shall retain regulatory authority over such areas.

4.1.4 Growth Impacts and Affordable Housing

Conclusions

To conclude this discussion, perhaps it would be enlightening to offer a quote from the 1975 Comprehensive Development Master Plan.

“There is not a single urban problem which would not receive a favorable impact from a slower population growth. The pressures for peripheral development with attendant land conversion would be lessened. Urban transportation difficulties might be easier to overcome. Almost all environmental impacts would be reduced, especially domestic waste disposal, and reduction in the water supply. Provision of low and moderate-income housing would be facilitated. School programs and overall operations could be improved. Local living cost increases might be relieved somewhat. Social dislocations and lack of community feeling might be mitigated. These are just some of the more important possible benefits from slower population growth, but they should not be considered as automatic occurrences. Local policy makers would need to consciously seize upon the opportunities forthcoming from a lull in the struggle with rapid growth”.¹

This observation was made at a time when there were 852,600 fewer people living in Miami-Dade County than today. The focus herein has been on the issue of need for affordable housing and related issues of increasing illegal unit construction and the benefits of more redevelopment. The housing problem was acknowledged in 1975 and it is a far larger problem today. The same is mostly true for the other issues mentioned, but the focus here is housing and what can be done to increase the supply of low and moderate-income units.

As indicated, the County has a number of housing programs to assist households in need at several income levels. Additional assisted housing is supplied by several cities and quasi independent housing authorities. The state administered Federal Tax Credit program provides a substantial number of lower cost units and U.S. HUD has direct housing assistance programs. These are all worthy and generally effective efforts and to the degree possible, should be expanded. However, more participation by the private, for-profit building industry could effectuate some significant gains in meeting affordable housing needs.

Proposed Revisions

The following revisions to the CDMP will advance the provision of affordable housing. Unless an existing objective or policy is mentioned, it can be assumed that these suggestions will lead to new objectives and/or policies in the appropriate element.

1. A moderately priced housing program based on inclusionary zoning should be considered as a policy initiative in the Housing Element.

¹ Metropolitan Dade County, Planning Department, Comprehensive Development Master Plan for Metropolitan Dade County, Part 3, Metropolitan Development Guide, Metropolitan Growth Factors, Relevant Population Policy: The Growth Rate, p. 132, March, 1975.

2. Objective 4 in the current Housing Element should be given renewed emphasis and policies 4A and 4B should be reworded to bring them up to date and make their action specific.
3. Reword, in the existing Housing Element, Objective 6 and Policy 6A to emphasize that all new affordable housing should be considered for location in reasonable proximity to job locations or public transit services.
4. The minimum densities allowed in the various CDMP residential categories should be raised and the minimum requirements for open space and recreational facilities on private property should be reviewed. Exceptions to the minimum densities would be allowed only where CDMP adopted concurrency LOS standards would be exceeded.
5. Generally promote in the CDMP more mixing of housing types, sizes, designs and higher densities. Specific standards should ultimately be written into the zoning code, an essential ingredient being the requiring of a mix of unit sizes.
6. The accessory apartment provision should be promoted.
7. A housing linkage program for Miami-Dade County should be put in place.²
8. Advocate the establishment of an affordable housing land trust fund.
9. Develop a program whereby the County can provide infrastructure improvement assistance for infill and redevelopment projects which include affordable housing.
10. Promote expansion of the Miami-Dade Transit Agency's joint development affordable housing projects.

With respect to attaining a better distribution of low cost, especially assisted, affordable housing, the program described in Appendix 1.4-B or some close approximation should be put in place. Where illegal conversions or new construction are concerned, a serious effort should be made to curtail them. At a minimum, the following should be done:

1. A strong public communication campaign should be carried out which emphasizes the illegality of the practice and the penalties involved.

² The term housing linkage refers to the approval of commercial or office development with the requirement that housing units, or fees in lieu of units, be provided by the developer. Linkage may be mandatory, requiring exactions of all new development or of developments with special permits or variances (often called quasi-mandatory), or incentive bonuses to the commercial development in exchange for affordable housing.

Developers of projects affected by local housing linkage programs are charged with fulfilling some form of obligation. Most programs afford a variation of the following: In lieu fee contributions; housing creation (construction of housing units); combination of fee contribution and construction of housing units; provision of financing for affordable housing; and land donation.

2. Prior to launching a more aggressive inspection program and associated penalties, an amnesty program, established by ordinance, should allow individuals an opportunity to come forward and get permits where necessary.
3. Penalties should be increased.
4. Improved promulgation of information about affordable housing programs should be achieved.

Most likely these recommendations, if implemented, will be carried out by other departments and agencies. The CDMP would provide policy support.

4.1.5 Water Supply Facility Workplan

Conclusions

An evaluation of water supply planning activities in Miami-Dade County shows that the County has been linking water supply demands and land use for more than four decades. The County, through the Water Facilities Master Plan, has identified sources of potable water and analyzed options to provide water to meet the growth demands for a twenty-year period. This plan is routinely updated to keep pace with population and regulatory changes.

The 2002 legislative changes to Chapter 163 F.S. designed to enhance coordination between water supply planning and land use planning have been practiced by Miami-Dade County, but have not been codified. Modifications of various CDMP policies, as required by these legislative actions, have been partially addressed through the proposed CDMP amendment to the Water and Sewer Subelement of the Water, Sewer and Solid Waste Element. The proposed amendment creates a Water Supply Facilities Workplan, which identifies the Water Facilities Master Plan as the appropriate document for water supply planning and satisfies the legislative requirements of maintaining and updating annually a 10 year list of capital improvements. Additionally, the Workplan emphasizes coordination of the LEC with local water supply. Other policies within the Water and Sewer Subelement have also been proposed for addition or modification, as necessary to ensure coordination with the LEC and provide a linkage between the Water Facilities Master Plan and the CDMP.

An evaluation of additional legislative requirements indicated that additions or modifications to policies contained in the Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element and the Intergovernmental Coordination Element of the CDMP were necessary for full compliance. Recommendations and proposals for policy revisions include a new policy to address the adequate identification of water supply sources, and modifications to existing policies to strengthen the coordination of the Water Facilities Master Plan with the LEC plan.

Proposed Revisions

Conservation, Aquifer Recharge, and Drainage Element

New Policy. A new policy under Objective 3 should be added stating that all current and future potable water source identification will be coordinated with the South Florida Water Management District Lower East Coast Plan prior to using such sources in future capacity projections. This policy should include the Water Facilities Master Plan prepared by WASD as the appropriate planning document for the County's water supply planning effort.

Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Policy 4E. This policy should be revised to emphasize coordination with the SFWMD in water supply planning.

4.2 ASSESSMENT OF CDMP ELEMENTS

4.2.1 Land Use Element

Conclusions

The overall objectives and philosophy of the Land Use Element should be maintained and do not require revising. However some updating of texts and maps is required. This section of the element evaluation identifies needed actions to address or implement identified changes as discussed in the other sections of this report. Additional changes are made to update and clarify the Interpretative Text. Proposed revisions include the identification of the need to revise or add objectives, policies, monitoring measures, interpretative text, Land Use Plan map, and future conditions maps. While actual proposed amendment language is not included, the general nature or type of changes is clearly described. Although, not specifically described below in the Proposed Revision section, all references in the Land Use Element goals, objectives, policies, Interpretive text and the Land Use Plan map to the short and long-term planning horizons of “2005” and “2015” should be changed to “2015” and 2025.”

Proposed Revisions to the Land Use Plan Map

The following changes to the Land Use Plan Map are proposed:

1. Delete from the UEA, the area bounded by theoretical NW 12 Street, theoretical 147 Avenue, SW 8 Street and theoretical 157 Avenue. This area is being purchased for an impoundment area and will not be available for development.
2. Add a mixed-use residential land use classification. This classification will help foster the development of walkable neighborhoods. The charrettes that the County has prepared with the public for Metropolitan and Community Urban Centers are designating areas for mixed use. This designation will also more accurately reflect on the LUP map the land use designations of municipal plans with this type of designation. Green space and open space provisions should be provided in this category for the residents of mixed-use projects that stand-alone.
3. Rename the title of the “Institutional and Public Facility” category as “Institutions, Communications, and Utilities”. Communication facilities such as cellular communication facilities, radio and television towers, satellite earth stations, and antenna fields are not addressed in the text for any urban land use classification. Currently, communication facilities are only included the portions of the text addressing certain Open Land and Environmental Protection Subareas.
4. Move the Metropolitan Urban Center that is adjacent to the Miami International Airport at NW 42 Avenue east to the site of the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC). The MIC is an excellent location to promote intensification of development since the area will be served by the people mover to the airport and two commuter rail lines, Metrorail and Tri-Rail.

5. Locate Community Urban Centers at the future stations along the north Metrorail corridor.
6. Locate a Community Urban Center at the south end of the South Dade Busway extension in Florida City.
7. Locate a Community Urban Center at the SW corner of SW 88 Street and SW 157 Avenue. This site, the proposed Kendall Town Center, will include a transit facility.
8. Locate a Community Urban Center at the site of Midway Mall at Palmetto Expressway and Flagler Street. This site, which includes a transit facility, has nearby commercial land that could be more intensely developed.
9. Extend the symbol designating the existing Metrorail line to the new Palmetto Station.
10. Incorporate land use plan changes that are based on the land use designations in municipal comprehensive plans that are either new or been revised since 1995
11. Designate as water the large lakes, five or more acres, which were created or expanded since 1995.
12. Depict land acquired since 1995 by the County using the Environmentally Endangered Lands Program with a designation as Environmentally Protected Parks.
13. Show lands acquired since 1995 by the state, federal and regional agencies for environmental purposes as Environmental Protection.
14. Designate lands acquired since 1995 for community and regional parks as Parks and Recreation.
15. Show lands acquired since 1995 for large institutional and public facilities.

Proposed Revisions to the Introduction of Land Use Element

The following updates to the Introduction are proposed:

1. Page I-1, first paragraph- Replace the phrase” fourth major update” with “fifth major update.”
2. Page I-2, first paragraph- Revise paragraph to include the 2003 Evaluation and Appraisal Report in the supporting material for this element.

Proposed Revisions to Objectives and Policies

The following changes to Objectives and Policies are proposed:

Policy 1D. This policy should be deleted since the requested report on infill development was completed in 1997.

Policy 1K. This policy should be revised to reflect that the County now participates in the Empowerment Zone Program and no longer participates in the Federal Enterprise Community Program.

Objective 2. This objective has been not yet been achieved but should be retained. The target date should be changed from 2005 to 2010.

Objective 3. This objective needs rewording to reflect CERP and other current environmental programs.

Policy 3A. Revise the text to reflect the full name of the “Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element.”

Policy 3C. This policy needs rewording to reflect CERP, other current environmental programs, Chapter 33 B of the Miami-Dade Code, and, if adopted, the provisions of the Zoning Code Rewrite.

Policy 3E.

- Revise title of the plan from “South Dade Land Use and Water Management Plan” to “South Miami-Dade Watershed Plan.”
- Update dates and committee titles in text.

New Policy Section 163.3178(7) of the Florida Statutes requires that the future land use and port elements shall provide for or identify disposal sites for dredged materials to assure proper long-term management of material dredged from navigation channels, sufficient long-range disposal capacity, environmental sensitivity and compatibility, and reasonable cost and transportation. No disposal sites currently exist but the Seaport Department is in the planning stages on the development of a Dredged Materials Management Plan, which will address long-term needs for spoil disposal and beneficial use of dredged material. A new policy that will require by 2005 the adoption of a Dredged Materials Management Plan that meets the requirements of Section 163.3178(7) is needed to address this requirement.

Policy 4F. Replace the phrase “South Florida Building Code” with “Florida Building Code.”

Objective 6. A rewording of this objective is needed to facilitate historic preservation efforts in the County.

Objective 7. The target date of 2003 should be removed.

Policy 7F. The policy should be revised. The target dates for planning the areas around rail stations to be compatible with the People’s Transportation Plan.

Policy 8D. This policy should be deleted. The farmland retention study requested by this policy will be completed 2003.

Policy 8H. This policy needs rewording to reflect CERP and other current environmental programs.

Policy 9F. This policy is being implemented by the preparation of individual ordinances for Metropolitan and Community Urban Centers such as the ordinance for downtown Kendall. Thus, the requirement for a single adoption date for the regulations is no longer applicable and should be removed.

Policy 9J. This policy should be deleted. The home office provisions in the zoning code have addressed the recommendations of this policy for home occupations.

Policy 9H. This policy on Neighborhood business node is addressed in the Draft Zoning Code Rewrite. This policy should be deleted if the Draft Zoning Code Rewrite is adopted prior to February 25, 2004.

Policy 9I. This policy on accessory apartments is addressed in the Draft Zoning Code Rewrite. This policy should be deleted if the Draft Zoning Code Rewrite is adopted prior to February 25, 2004.

Policy 9K. The policy should be revised to include planning for Urban Centers, corridors and sectors.

Policy 9L. The County has established a design studio to facilitate urban design efforts in the area-planning program and has a zoning re-write project underway that is incorporating urban design provisions. The target date of 2000 should be revised to 2005.

Policy 9M. This policy should be deleted since the urban design manual required by the policy has been produced.

Policy 9N. The current zoning re-write project is addressing urban design considerations in the Zoning Code, however, the revision of the Subdivision Regulations has not been initiated. This policy needs to be reworded to have the Public Works Department review and update the Subdivision Regulations for urban design purposes.

Policy 9Q. This policy should be deleted since its purpose of limiting the placement of private schools near the UDB was accomplished with the passage of Ordinance No. 02-46.

Policy 10B. This policy has not been achieved. The target date of 2000 should be revised to 2005.

New Policy. A new policy is needed that would help improve energy efficiency in the County by recommending the use of Green Building Standards. Miami-Dade County's greenhouse gas emissions increased in the 1988-1999 period 20.2%, while the County's population increased

16.4%. The increase in greenhouse gas emissions is mostly due to the growth in electrical usage. This growth is attributed to the proliferation of appliances such as air-conditioning, computers, pool pumps and faxes, an increase on the average size of homes, the growth of the county towards the west (the area with hotter daytime temperatures during summer) and an increase in gas consumption due to the advent of SUV's.

Proposed Revisions to Monitoring Measures

The following changes to the Monitoring Program and Procedures are proposed:

Objective 1. Monitoring measures B and C currently refer to Community Development (CD) areas as the geographic basis for collecting information. The Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) no longer keeps project information on a CD area basis. These monitoring measures should be revised to reflect the current approach of funding CDBG activities by Commission Districts.

Objective 3. The Monitoring measure should be expanded to look at development in environmentally sensitive areas (i.e. lakebelt) other than just the 8.5 Square Mile.

Objective 6. Revise the text of the monitoring measure to include historical as well as archaeological sites, districts and zones. This revision will reflect the intent of the objective.

Objective 7. Develop a new monitoring measure for Objective 7 since this objective was added without a monitoring measure in 1999.

Objective 10. Replace in monitoring measure A the reference to "the South Florida Building Code, the Metro Dade Zoning Code" with "the Florida Building Code, the Miami Dade Zoning Code." Also change the measurement in Monitoring Measure C from "per 1000 adults" to "per 1000 people."

Proposed Revisions to EAR Contents and Formulation Procedure

1. Revise text to reflect the current requirements for an EAR.

Proposed Revisions to the Land Use Plan Interpretative Text

The following changes to the Land Use Plan Interpretative Text are proposed:

General

1. This chapter should be rewritten so that it is more user friendly to the general public. This need is especially true once the CDMP document is placed on the website and is generally available to any resident with access to the Internet. A recommendation on page I-265 of the 1995 EAR was that "...the Land Use Element chapter, Interpretation of the Land Use Plan Map, be reviewed and streamlined to the extent possible to make it less legalistic and easier to read while retaining the legal integrity of the CDMP." This

recommendation is still valid. In addition, the possible use of graphics such as illustrations or pictures should be considered in the rewrite to help people understand some of the concepts in the text.

New Sections

1. Create a new section for water areas identifying permitted uses. Currently, water is not addressed or defined in the text. However, “Water” is a designation on the LUP Map.
2. Create a new section or subsection for Environmentally Protected Park, which is designated on the LUP map. Currently, Environmentally Protected Park is addressed in the text as a paragraph under the Park and Recreation classification.
3. Create a new section to address the mixed-use residential land use classification.

Introduction

1. Reduce the inconsistency between the maximum intensity for non-residential uses permitted in the Urban Infill Area (2.0 FAR) or Urbanizing Area (1.25 FAR) and the maximum intensity permitted on the edge of the Metropolitan Urban Center (0.75 FAR) or the edge of the Community Urban Center (0.50 FAR). Urban Centers are located either in the Urban Infill Area or the Urbanizing Area, the area between the Urban Development Boundary and the Urban Infill Area.

Residential Communities

1. Review the overlaps between the density ranges of the Residential Community Categories. For example, the maximum density in the Low Density classification is 6.0 per gross acre, which is higher than the minimum density of 5.0 per gross acre for the Low-Medium Density classification. This same type of overlap is found with the Medium-High Density and High Density classifications.
2. The text needs to identify what major utility uses such as a transmission line or a substation could be permitted. Guidelines for major utility uses should be developed.

Medium-High Density

1. Develop a density incentive in this land use classification for good urban design. The current approach of granting for good urban design a one-density increase or a two-density increase in land use classification on a property is not viable for properties already at the maximum density permitted, excluding Urban Center, for unincorporated Miami-Dade County.

Density Increase With Urban Design

1. Develop standards or guidelines to determine if a one-density increase or a two-density increase is more appropriate in a particular property.

Accessory Apartments

1. This subsection is addressed by the draft Zoning Code Rewrite. The text needs to be reworded if the draft Code Rewrite is adopted prior to February 25, 2004.

Neighborhood Business Node

1. This subsection is addressed by the draft Zoning Code Rewrite. The text needs to be reworded if the draft Code Rewrite is adopted prior to February 25, 2004.

Home Occupations

1. This subsection should be deleted since the home office provisions of the Zoning Code addresses the concern for home occupations.

Industrial and Office

1. The text should identify what major utility uses such as a transmission line or a substation could be permitted. Guidelines for major utility uses should be developed.
2. Add language to permit and guide development of live/work and work/live spaces such as lofts for artists and small business owners.
3. Develop criteria or standards to determine what commercial uses can be permitted in areas designated as Industrial and Office
4. Revise the text so that applicants for a commercial or residential development will be required to demonstrate that significant industrial capacity in the area will remain if their development will be approved. Based on a large sample, the Research Section of the Department of Planning and Zoning has determined that approximately 60 percent of the vacant industrially zoned land in 1985 has been developed or designated for a use other than industrial.

Business and Office

1. The text for the Business and Office designation was amended in 2002 to provide guidelines on the depth of strips for office and commercial uses. However, guidelines are needed on the depth of the strip for the other uses that can be permitted under the Business and Office designation such as residential uses at one density category higher than the LUP map designation of adjacent property and the mixing of residential use with commercial, office and hotel uses.
2. Add language to guide development of live/work and work/live spaces such as lofts for artists and small business owners.
3. The text needs to identify what major utility uses such as a transmission line or a substation could be permitted. Guidelines for major utility uses should be developed.

Office/Residential

1. Guidelines in the text on the depth of strips for the various permitted land uses under this designation are needed.
2. The text should identify what major utility uses such as a transmission line or a substation could be permitted in this land use classification. Guidelines for major utility uses should be developed.

Urban Centers

1. Reduce the inconsistency between the maximum intensity for non-residential uses permitted in the Urban Infill Area (2.0 FAR) or Urbanizing Area (1.25 FAR) and the maximum intensity permitted on the edge of the Metropolitan Urban Center (0.75 FAR) or the edge of the Community Urban Center (0.50 FAR). Urban Centers are located either in the Urban Infill Area or the Urbanizing Area, the area between the Urban Development Boundary and the Urban Infill Area.

Parks and Recreation

1. The text needs to identify what major utility uses such as a transmission line or a substation could be permitted. Guidelines for sitting major utility uses should be developed.

Institutional and Public Facility

1. Revise the title of this section from “Institutional and Public Facility” to ‘Institutions, Utilities and Communications’. Communication facilities such as cellular communication facilities, radio and television towers, satellite earth stations, and antenna fields are not addressed in the text for any urban land use classification. Guidelines for communication facilities in urban areas should be developed. Currently, communication facilities are only included the portions of the text addressing certain Open Land and Environmental Protection Subareas.
2. The text needs to provide guidance in the sitting of community facilities such as libraries and community centers
3. Guidelines for sitting major utility uses should be developed.

Transportation

1. The text needs to be revised to permit service, retail and office activities at railroad terminals
2. The text needs to be revised to permit industrial and office uses in railroad yards

3. The text needs to identify what major utility uses such as a transmission line or a substation could be permitted. Guidelines for major utility uses should be developed.

Urban Development Boundary

1. If the Board of County Commissioners prior to the end of the filing period for the EAR based CDMP Amendments adopts the draft zoning code re-write, the text referencing the zoning code needs to be revised.

Urban Development Subject to Farmland Conversion Study Opportunity

1. Replace the phrase “Land Use Policy No. 7D” with “Land Use Policy No. 8D”

Agriculture

1. Revise the text on the creation of parcels smaller than 5 acres for residential use. The text needs to be clarified.
2. The text needs to identify what utility uses could be permitted. Guidelines for major utility uses should be developed.
3. If the Board of County Commissioners prior to the end of the filing period for the EAR-based CDMP Amendments adopts the draft zoning code re-write, the text referencing the zoning code needs to be revised.

Agricultural Subarea 1 (East Everglades Agricultural Area)

1. Update text to reflect changes resulting from the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) and other new environmental programs.

Open Land

1. Update the text for the entire section including associated subsections to reflect changes resulting from CERP and other new environmental programs.

2. If the Board of County Commissioners, prior to the end of the filing period for the EAR based CDMP Amendments, adopts the draft zoning code re-write, the text concerning the zoning code needs to be revised.

Open Land Subarea 2 (Northwest Wellfield)

1. Third line- revise the description of the southern boundary of the Subarea to reflect changes resulting from by Beacon Lakes DRI and Shoppylane CDMP Amendments.

Open Land Subarea 4 (East Everglades Residential Areas)

1. Revise name of subarea from “East Everglades Residential Areas” to ”8 ½ Square Mile Area.” This revision will reflect the common name for this area.

Environmental Protection

1. Update the text for the entire section including associated subsections to reflect changes resulting from CERP and other new environmental programs.

Environmental Protection Subarea A (National Parks and Preserves, and State Water Conservation Area)

1. The text needs to identify what utility uses could be permitted in this subarea. For example, this subarea contains a transmission line but the text does not permit this use.

Environmental Protection Subarea B (Everglades National Park Expansion Area)

1. This subarea was redesignated from “Environmental Protection” to “Environmentally Protected Park” in 1996. Thus, it is no longer under the “Environmental Protection” classification. This subsection should be deleted.

Environmental Protection Subarea E (Southeast Wetlands)

1. Replace the phrase “Open Land Subarea 6” with “Open Land Subarea 5.”

Environmental Protection Subarea F (Coastal Wetlands and Hammocks)

1. Revise the text to reflect the full name of the “Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element.”

Concepts and Limitations of the Land Use Plan Map

Limitations.

1. Update the 1990 acreage total for urban and agriculture uses with a total from the 2001 land use file.

Other Land Uses Not Addressed

1. The “Unusual Use” provisions of the zoning code are no longer in effect. Thus, the provision for “unusual uses” in this subsection needs to be deleted and the text revised. The various land use categories will need to be reviewed for possible inclusion of uses formerly identified as "unusual".

Wellfield Areas.

1. Revise the text to reflect the full name of the “Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element.”

Ultimate Development Area.

1. Revise the discussion on timeframes.

Proposed Revisions to the Future Historic and Natural Resources Text

The following changes to the Future Historic and Natural Resources Text are proposed:

Introduction

1. Revise the text to reflect the full name of the “Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element.”
2. Update the text for the entire section including associated subsections to reflect changes resulting from CERP and new environmental programs.

Future Natural Resources

1. Revise the text to reflect the full name of the “Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element.”

Proposed Revisions to the Map Series

The following changes to the Map Series are proposed:

1. Create a Public Lands Acquisition Map depicting the proposed acquisitions of CERP and other environmental programs
2. On Figure 4 (Open Lands Subareas), delete from Open Land Subarea 2, Northwest Wellfield, the areas covered by Beacon Lakes DRI and Shoppylund CDMP Amendments. This revision will reflect the changes to the Figure resulting from the CDMP Amendments.

3. Revise Figures 4 (Open Lands Subareas) and 5 (Environmental Protection Subareas) to reflect changes resulting from the CERP and other environmental programs.
4. Update information on Figures, 6 (Population Estimates and Projections), Figure 7 (Future Historic Districts and Archaeological Zones), Figure 8 (Future Wellfields and Wellfield Protection Areas), Figure 11 (Areas Subject to Coastal Flooding), Figure 12 (Future Wetlands) and Figure 15 (Water Resources in Dade County).
5. Figure 14 (Generalized Soil Types) contains an error that needs to be corrected. According to the current map, large portions of the Everglades National Park and adjacent areas are comprised of man-made lands rather than natural soil types. In addition, this map needs to be updated since it is based on a 1954 soil survey. The US Department of Agriculture published in 1996 a new soil survey for Miami-Dade County.

4.2.2. Transportation Element

Conclusions

The overall goal of this Element of developing and maintaining an integrated multimodal transportation system has been achieved. The County has completed, programmed and planned transportation improvements that furthered the integration of the different modes of transportation for the circulation of motorized and non-motorized traffic. All the existing objectives and policies of this element are deemed relevant and, therefore, should be retained with certain changes and updates necessary to continue to achieve the adopted goal. Monitoring measures should be adopted to monitor progress and assess achievement of the various objectives contained in the Transportation Element.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 1. The reporting years in this objective should be changed from “1996 and 2002” to “2003 and 2010”.

Policy 1D. Delete the Miami Intermodal Center, Palmetto Metrorail Station, Golden Glades interchange Multimodal Facility, and Mount Sinai Intermodal Transportation Center as the former were completed or are under construction, and latter was determined infeasible.

Objective 2. The target date in this objective should be changed from “2002” to “2008”.

Policy 2B. The target date in this objective should be changed from “1999” to “2008”.

Objective 3. The target period of this objective should be changed from “1998 through 2002” to “2004 through 2007”.

Policy 3A. The scheduled date in this policy should be changed from “2000/2001” to “2005/2006”.

Policy 3B. The scheduled date in this policy should be changed from “1998/1999” to “2003/2004”.

Proposed Monitoring Program

A new Monitoring Program Section should be added to be consistent with current procedures. The following is the proposed Transportation Element’s Monitoring Program.

Objective 1 Monitoring Measure. This measure should quantify the number of transportation plans prepared and adopted by State, Regional and local governments reviewed during the EAR reporting period; and review and analyze Metrorail, Metrobus and Metromover boardings and compare the boarding rates with the County’s population growth rates for same period.

Objective 2 Monitoring Measure. This measure should list and quantify the number of bicycle and pedestrian facilities reviewed through site planning and plat reviews, and number of reviews of other transportation improvement plans; and implementation status of the Metro-Bicycle Facilities Plan.

Objective 3 Monitoring Measure. The recommended measure should include the number of changes to the procedures, methodology and analytical tools adopted as a result of minor and major updates of the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan; and number of land use changes as a result of transportation planning.

4.2.2.1. Traffic Circulation Subelement

Conclusions

One major conclusion resulting from the evaluation of the Traffic Circulation Subelement's goal, objectives and policies is that Miami-Dade County has made great progress toward achieving the Subelement's goal of developing and maintaining a safe, efficient traffic circulation system in Miami-Dade County that provides ease of mobility for people and goods. Second, the County continues to strive to maintain the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standard that is targeted for achievement in the year 2005. And third, the County adopted a dedicated source of revenue to support current and future transit plans that will provide the residents and visitors with alternative modes of transportation. However, the County must continue to seek funding to implement projects contained in the Needs Plan for the future operation and maintenance of the traffic circulation system.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 1. The target date should be changed from "2005" to "2010".

Policy 1B. should be amended to reflect the change made by FDOT to the adopted LOS standards for FIHS controlled access facilities.

Policy 1I. The target date should be changed from "1998" to "2005".

Policy 1L. This policy should be deleted since roadways were analyzed and included in the MPO adopted 2025 LRTP as Priority III planned improvements.

Proposed Revisions to the Future Traffic Circulation Map Series

Future Condition Maps. All future condition maps should be revised and updated for consistency with the Transportation Plan to the Year 2025 and the proposed new planning horizon of the CDMP.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 7 Monitoring Measure. The monitoring measure for Objective 7 should be deleted since this monitoring measure does not adequately address the specific concern of Objective 7.

Objective 8 Monitoring Measure. The Traffic Circulation Subelement only has seven objectives. This monitoring measure should be renumbered “Objective 7 Monitoring Measure” because this is the monitoring measure that adequately addresses the intent of Objective 7.

4.2.2.2. Mass Transit Subelement

Conclusions

One major conclusion resulting from the evaluation of the Mass Transit Subelement's goal, objectives and policies is that Miami-Dade County has made great progress toward achieving the Subelement's goal of maintaining, operating and developing a mass transit system that is efficient, convenient, accessible and affordable to all residents and tourist. Second, the County has maintained the Level of Service (LOS) standard that was targeted for achievement in the year 2005. And third, the County adopted a dedicated source of revenue to support current and future transit plans. However, the County must continue to seek for alternative sources of funding for the future operation and maintenance of the transit system.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 1. The target date in Objective 1 should be changed from "2005" to "2007". All policies under this objective are still relevant, but Policy 1A should be modified.

Policy 1A. This policy should be retained but modified to change the headways of the minimum peak-hour mass transit level-of-service from “60 minutes” to “30 minutes”. This change is necessary to reflect the new headways proposed in the People's Transportation Plan.

Objective 3. This objective requires the provision of sound funding base utilizing public and private sources to assure maintenance of existing and implementation of needed transportation improvements. The objective continues to be relevant and no changes to the text of this objective are presently recommended.

Policy 3A. Part of the requirements of this policy was achieved with the passage of the half-cent sales tax, the dedicated source of revenue to support current and future transit operations. However, the balancing requirement of this policy is still valid and should be retained. Therefore, this policy should be modified to consider other alternative sources of funding such as levies on parking facilities, transit impact fees, joint development projects, and advertising and concessions proposals.

Objective 7. The target date in Objective 7 should be changed from “1998” to “2007”.

Proposed Revisions to the Future Mass Transit Map Series

Update and prepare revised future map series consistent with the new CDMP planning horizon.

4.2.2.3. Aviation Subelement

Conclusions

The overall goal of this subelement has been furthered since its adoption in 1996. As noted in Evaluation Section, the objectives of this subelement have been achieved and because of their nature continue to be relevant. All the existing objectives and policies are deemed relevant and should be retained with certain changes and updates.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 1. This objective has been successfully achieved, continues to be relevant and should be retained. However, MDAD staff is requesting changing "... minimize delay" to read, "... optimize level of service."

Policy 1A. This policy should be modified to update the projected passenger levels and their attainment dates and Policy 1B should be changed to revise forecast attainment dates. Policy 1C, on the other hand, should be revised to change its intent from preparation of the Heliport System Plan to implementation of the plan.

Policies 2A, 2B and 2C. These policies continue to be relevant and should be retained. However, these policies should be modified to reflect the updated roles of each of the County's airports.

Objective 3. This objective has been achieved, continues to be relevant and should be retained. However, the text of this objective should be modified to further clarify its intent.

Policies 3B and 3C. The texts of Policies 3B and 3C should be modified to further clarify their intent.

Objective 4. This objective has been achieved, continues to be relevant and should be retained. However, the text of this objective should be modified to further clarify its intent.

Policy 7A. This policy should be revised to reflect the updated role of the Homestead Air Reserve Base.

Policy 9A. The target year of this policy should be changed from "2015" to "2020".

Policy 9B. This policy should be modified to clarify the use of emerging technology and the type of airplanes with larger wingspans.

Proposed Revisions to Aviation Facilities Maps

Update and prepare revised aviation facilities and airport physical layout plan maps.

4.2.2.4. The Port of Miami River Subelement

Conclusions

One conclusion resulting from the evaluation of the Port of Miami River Subelement is that great progress has been made toward achieving the subelement's goal of maintaining and enhancing the water quality, attractiveness and economic vitality of the Miami River. Major achievements accomplished since 1995 include the retrofitting of the stormwater drainage systems in the Miami River area and the development of a more favorable cost-sharing funding and a phased dredging plan for the dredging of the River. However, the Miami River Commission, the City and County, and state and federal governments must continue to work to implement the dredging plan and the recommendations of the Miami River Urban Infill Plan to make the river economically stronger and environmentally sound.

In summary, the overall goal of this subelement has been furthered since its adoption in 1996. The objectives have been achieved, continue to be relevant and should be retained. All the existing policies are also deemed to be relevant and, therefore, should be retained. However, monitoring measures shall be reviewed and fine-tuned during the EAR-based plan amendment process.

Proposed Revisions

No revisions are presently recommended.

4.2.2.5 The Port of Miami Master Plan Subelement

Conclusions

The overall goal of the Updated Port of Miami Master Plan Subelement has been furthered since its adoption in March 2000. As noted in the Evaluation Section of this report, the goals, objectives and policies of this subelement have been achieved, continue to be relevant, and should be retained with certain changes and updates.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 1. This objective has been successfully achieved and remains relevant, but its 2005 planning horizon should be extended to 2020. The reason is because the Port has a conceptualized 2020 Master Development Master Plan, which accounts for increase projections and redevelopment necessary to maintain the world's position as the No. 1 cruise port.

Policy 1A. This policy should be modified to eliminate the requirement for promoting public access to waterfront and recreation areas for security reasons. All other policies remain relevant, should be retained and no changes are presently recommended.

Objective 2. This objective has been achieved, remains relevant and should be retained. However, objective's planning horizon should be changed from "2005" to "2020" for the same reason explained above.

Policies 2D. Policy 2D should be deleted since the 1992 Cargo Master Plan was essentially updated in the Port's 2020 Master Development Plan.

Policy 3A. This policy will be deleted. With the development of the DataStream Program, the Port's comprehensive preventive maintenance program, the requirement of this policy has been implemented.

Policies 4C and 4D. The target years of Policies 4C and 4D should be extended from "2001" to "2006" and "2007", respectively, because the Port is still exploring options for mitigation banking for expansion projects and in the planning stages on the development of a Dredged Materials Management Plan.

Policy 6C. This policy should be removed in light of new security issues.

Policy 10A. This policy should be modified to delete the requirement for preparing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, but the requirement for implementation of this policy should be retained. The reason for this modification is because the Port has completed a Comprehensive Stormwater System Evaluation as part of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process and consultants are now developing an overall Stormwater Management Plan.

Policy 10B. This policy should also be modified to change the time frame for completing the Stormwater Master Plan from year-end 2000 to year-end 2004. The reason for this change is because the Port's consultants are now developing the Stormwater Management Plan. The plan is to be completed in 2004.

Policy 10C. This policy should be modified to reflect the fact that the required consent agreement between the Port and DERM to ensure that extension of sanitary sewer lines into the western half of the port and elimination of septic tank systems will occur by year-end 2005 was signed in 2001. However, the implementation part of this policy and the time frame should be retained.

Policy 10D. This policy should also be modified to change the time frame for preparing the study for water lines capacity from year-end 2000 to year-end 2004 because the planning for future water needs is currently underway.

Proposed Revisions to the Monitoring Program

The following changes to the Monitoring Measures are proposed:

Objective 1. Change the year in two of the monitoring measures from “1998” to “2003”, the year of the present EAR.

Objective 2. Change the year in two of the monitoring measures from “1998” to “2003”, the year of the present EAR.

Objective 10. Change the year in the monitoring measure from “1998” to “2003”, the year of the present EAR.

4.2.3 Housing Element

Conclusions

This section of the element evaluation presents a summary of general conclusions and identifies needed actions and/or proposed amendments to address or implement identified changes as discussed in other sections of this report. Proposed revisions include the identification of the need to revise some policies, and monitoring and evaluation procedures. While actual proposed amendment language is not included, the general nature or type of change is clearly described. All proposed revisions presented here have been carefully linked to the evaluation of current conditions within the County, objective achievement, issues and other sections of this report.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 1. This objective has been partially achieved. This is a worthy objective, but it has to be recognized that there is no good way to measure progress with respect to people with disabilities or for sexual orientation.

Policy 1B needs to be rewritten for intent and clarity. Policy 1C should be modified for specificity.

Objective 2. This objective has been achieved in the sense that, except for the homeless, everyone is housed. About 100,000 housing units were added between 1995 and 2002 and sufficient land was available. Land is a factor that can vary widely for a given amount of housing. The emphasis on land should be reduced by providing a range depending on densities. The target year must be changed to 2025 and mobile homes deleted.

Policy 2A needs to be revised to reflect new County intentions and policies. Mobile homes need to be deleted from Policies 2B and 2C.

Policy 2D needs to be rewritten to update and possibly expand what is intended with respect to zoning code changes.

Objective 3. This objective was basically not achieved; the affordable situation has worsened since 1995. The target year needs to be advanced to 2025 and a new needs estimate provided.

Policy 3D should be revised to include updated examples of affordable housing financing mechanisms.

Objective 4. This objective was essentially not achieved. It should be retained and strengthened.

Both Policies 4A and 4B should be retained and modified.

Objective 5. It is not known to what degree this objective was achieved. Data for measuring substandard housing is not available nor is data on adaptive reuse. More detailed data on rehab

needs to be acquired. The objective needs to be reworked to retain the basic intent, but in a way that is measurable.

Policies 5C and 5D. These policies can be deleted as they are being carried out.

Objective 6. This objective may have been partially achieved; data is not sufficient to make a clear determination. The objective needs a major overhaul. The first part should be merged with Objective 5 and the second part made into a stand-alone objective.

Policy 6B. This policy needs rewording to update it.

Policy 6C. This policy should be investigated to determine if it is still necessary.

Objective 6 – New Policy. A new policy should be added regarding gaining affordable housing from the existing stock.

Objective 7. Through the activities of the Community Planning Section, a very good start has been made in achieving this objective. The word “encourage” will be replaced by “bring about” and the objective will be revised for proper emphasis.

Policy 7B. Policy 7B is no longer needed and should be deleted.

Policy 7D. Policy 7D needs rewriting for clarity.

Objective 8. The objective has been largely achieved, but is no longer totally relevant. It needs to be redirected to meet the needs of the future, or deleted.

As with the objective, both policies under it need to be closely reviewed to determine what the intent should be.

Objective 9. This objective is being achieved through the County’s variety of excellent programs. Having sufficient resources to meet total needs is always a problem.

Policies 9A, 9B and 9C can be consolidated.

Objective 10. This objective is being achieved.

Proposed Revisions to the Monitoring Program

The following changes to the Monitoring Measures as listed in the Evaluation Assessment Review are proposed:

Goal I, Objective 1. Residential segregation indices using census and other data as necessary and available will be used to report on results achieved related to this objective.

Goal I, Objective 2. Using land use and housing data (census or other sources), compare the distribution of housing types, costs and densities between 2003 and 2010.

Goal I, Objective 3. The housing cost-household income profile for 2003 and 2010 will be compared.

Goal I, Objective 4. The measure of achievement for this objective will consist of listing and describing the various means employed to inform the public about the characteristics of affordable housing and the development of it.

Goal II, Objective 5. The number of units rehabilitated through the various Miami-Dade County sponsored or approved programs will be reported for the seven years prior to year 2010. The objective will be modified with respect to substandard units as data is not available. Monitoring measures will be adjusted accordingly.

Goal II, Objective 6. Objective will be completely reworked; new monitoring measure will be required.

Goal III, Objective 7. The administrative and programmatic efforts to meet this objective will be described.

Goal III, Objective 8. The objective will be revised or possibly deleted. Monitoring measures will follow accordingly.

Goal III, Objective 9. Information and data compiled by the specific agencies dealing with these special client groups will be obtained and analyzed in order to evaluate success in meeting this objective.

Goal III, Objective 10. The records of the agencies which are responsible for relocation of displaced households will be the basis for assessing this objective achievement.

4.2.4 Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element

Conclusions

An evaluation of objectives contained in the Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element indicates that the County has been successful in conserving and protecting its ecosystems and natural resources. Air programs have realized an overall improvement in general air quality and a continued reduction in toxics. Data from the County's surface water monitoring programs indicate continued improvement in the canals although achievement has been slow. Biscayne Bay water quality continues to be good. The wellfield monitoring program indicate that major contaminant sources within the wellfield protection areas have been significantly reduced with most of these raw water supplies at or near drinking water quality.

Miami-Dade County has continued to protect aquifer recharge areas through the maintenance of wetland areas and the implementation of the cut and fill criteria. Drainage systems within the County are designed for the maximum recharge of the aquifer. The creation of stormwater master plans for each primary basin is two years ahead of the original completion date. Additionally, over \$800 million of stormwater projects have been funded to increase the drainage efficiency and reduce flooding throughout the County.

Agricultural and rock mining interests are a major portion of the County's economy and are strongly encouraged. Due to increasing land development pressures, the County has undertaken a study to assess strategies for retention of agricultural lands. This study is projected for completion in the summer 2003.

Wetlands, natural forest communities have been maintained and significantly increased since 1995; however, exotic plant species continue to be a concern. Programs for freshwater fishes and wildlife, while locally encouraged, are mainly implemented on a more regional scale.

Proposed Revisions

Policy 1A. This policy should be reworded to reflect continual compliance of air emissions from hazardous waste facilities and not be year specific. Additionally, Policy 1A should be rephrased to limit emissions and public exposure to EPA defined criteria and other air pollutants.

Policy 1B. This policy should be reworded so as not to be year specific.

Policy 1C. This policy should be expanded to discourage stationary air sources next to residential land uses.

Policy 1E. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection allows the disposal of plastic mulch. Therefore this policy is no longer applicable and should be deleted.

Policy 1F. This policy should be rewritten to include other fumigants since methyl bromide will soon be phased out and may be replaced with other volatile fumigants.

Policy 1G. This policy should be expanded to clarify new asbestos requirements.

Policy 1H. This policy should be modified to address air toxic program responsibilities.

Policy 1J. This policy should be changed to address ozone depleting compounds and not just CFCs or HCFCs.

Policy 1K. This policy should be expanded to reflect specific recommendations of the CO2 plan. The policy should no longer be year specific.

Policy 1L. This policy should include the word “maintain” along with “expand” for the air monitoring network.

Objective 1 New Policy. A new policy should be drafted which will encourage the seeking of funds for voluntary outreach programs, air monitoring, and/or implementation of CO2 Plan recommendations.

Policy 2F. This policy should be reworded to reflect the current status of the Best Management Practices.

Policy 2H. This policy should be revisited since an investigation into the use of fertilizers in the county may not be feasible.

Objective 2 Monitoring Measure. A second monitoring measure related to groundwater exceedances should be developed for this objective.

Policy 3D. This policy should be reworded to reflect the application of agricultural best management practices.

Policy 3E. This policy should be reworded to better define acceptable ancillary uses in this area.

Policy 3G. This policy may need to be reworded with regard to wellhead protection areas.

Objective 3 New Policy. A new policy or additional language to an existing policy may be necessary to address protection of proposed South Dade Wellfield area protection zones.

Objective 3 New Policy. A new policy may be sought to limit the issuance of variances in wellfield protection zones.

Policy 4E. This policy should be revised to include a more current statement regarding water reuse.

Objective 4 Monitoring Measure. Since it has been determined that wetlands improve water quality but may not be indicative of aquifer recharge or water storage, the monitoring measure for this objective should be revised to include information on cut and fill permits in the various

basin areas. A database including information on the number of permitted developments with insufficient land storage retention areas should be developed and tracked.

Objective 5. The date of 2007 in the Objective should be revised to reflect a new date of 2005. Additional wording modifications should be made to reflect a more current status of the master plan process.

Policy 5A. The pollutant target criteria as identified in Policy 5A should be updated to reflect the most recent criteria.

Policy 5D. This policy should be retained; however the planning periods may be modified.

Objective 5 New Policy. A new policy to encourage buffer areas between water impoundment areas and development to reduce the risk of flooding, should be added.

Objective 5 New Policy. A new policy should be added to study stormwater drainage criteria cited in the County Code and revise if necessary.

Objective 7 New Policy. A new policy should be added seeking a dedicated source of funding for long-term management of EEL and Natural Areas.

Objective 7 New Policy. A new policy should be added to encourage the streamlining of wetlands permitting through the delegation of the permitting process from the SFWMD to Miami-Dade County.

Objective 7 New Policy. A new policy should be added to encourage consistency between CERP objectives and requested wetland alteration projects

Policy 8F. This policy addresses “controlled burns” which should be updated to more accurately address prescribed burns in forest lands.

Policy 8I. The listings of exotic pest plants should be reviewed and updated in this policy.

Objective 8 New Policy. Miami-Dade County through the Landscape Code is seeking to increase the canopy cover of the County. The goal for this effort is a 30% canopy. It is believed a new policy concerning this effort should be included.

Objective 8 New Policy. A new policy encouraging the creation of an assistance program for private NFC and EEL covenant holders should be added.

Appendix 2.4-A. The list of State and Federal Designated Endangered, Threatened and Potentially Endangered Flora as contained in Appendix A should be updated.

Appendix 2.4-B. The list of State and Federal Designated Endangered, Threatened and Potentially Endangered Fauna as contained in Appendix B should be updated.

4.2.5 Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Element

4.2.5.1 Water and Sewer Subelement

Conclusions

The EAR analysis indicates that the County has been successful in meeting the goal, objectives, and policies of the Water and Sewer Subelement, which is to provide for potable water and sanitary sewer facilities that meet the County's needs. These facilities and water and sanitary sewer services have further shown progress in promoting the public health, environmental protection, operational efficiency, CDMP-planned land use, and economic opportunity within the County. Miami-Dade's Water and Sewer Department (WASD) has continued to implement objectives and policies in accord with the Element's goal as well as correct deficiencies identified by the State and federal government. The County has achieved this at the same time that rates for water users have been kept at an affordable level, water use for an expanding population has remained steady, per capita water demand and unaccounted for water has been reduced as a result of WASD's aggressive water conservation program, the County has programmed improvements to the water and wastewater treatment plants in anticipation of expected increases in demand, and the County has worked to ensure that a reliable water supply is available.

Constant effort is needed to ensure that the County continues to provide water and sanitary sewer facilities meeting the needs of the community. The County must continue monitoring the water supply and effluent for quality to ensure a safe and reliable potable water supply. In addition to complying with existing regulations, the County also must comply with new regulations, such as new federal requirements for community water systems to conduct Vulnerability Assessments as part of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, which amends part of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Proposed Revisions

Policy 1H. This policy should be modified to require a public hearing before any consideration of extending water supply or wastewater collection lines into areas designated Agriculture, Open Land or Environmental Protection on the Land Use Plan map.

Policy 2A.1 (a). As part of the potable water Level of Service, the regional treatment system is obligated to provide an average daily capacity of 2 percent above the average daily per capita system demand for the preceding 5 years. While the intent is clear, the actual language should be modified to clarify the process for achieving the LOS including the removal of the words "per capita".

Policy 2A.2 (c). Similarly to the potable water Level of Service, the regional sewerage system is obligated to provide capacity to meet per capita demand, and the comment is the same. Therefore, the words "per capita" should, again, be eliminated.

Policy 2E. The policy is concerned with the County's policy of installing oversize water and sewer mains and associated facilities in anticipation of future needs, as an efficiency measure. The policy, however, presumes, and may in fact induce, further growth out toward the urban fringe. A suggested modification would adjust this policy in terms of distance of development from the Urban Development Boundary, while fully understanding that such boundary is not a static, immutable border beyond which development may never grow.

Policy 2F. The policy calls for expansion of water and wastewater treatment plants to meet demand through the year 2015. A suggested modification would instead provide for expansion to meet demand through the planning horizons noted in the respective potable water and sanitary sewer Master Plans.

Policy 3A.6. Policy 3A directs that public facility improvements will be evaluated for funding in accordance with several criteria. Policy 3A.6 cites additional criteria for the potable water supply system to follow, and although it is not stated that the criteria are to follow any particular order, such order seems implicit. It is therefore suggested that (d) and (e) be switched in order, which would then put providing water supply capacity to existing development and redevelopment ahead of new development.

Policy 3E. This policy calls for full implementation of wastewater system improvements in accord with agreements with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency with regard to deficiencies in the sanitary sewer collection system. Modification would change this to reflect that the program has been ongoing and is due to be completed within the next several years, subject to the satisfaction of the above agencies and the Court having jurisdiction of the agreements. This policy could also be expanded to encompass issues related to disposal of effluent from the wastewater treatment plants.

Policy 6C. The policy directs the County to investigate and implement Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) techniques. The policy should be modified to reflect ongoing developments in the implementation of ASR, such that testing has occurred, and that the County is awaiting approval from the appropriate regulatory bodies to fully implement ASR.

Policy 6E. The policy directs the County to investigate the feasibility of reclaimed water use. The County has done so, and several projects have been implemented, including the use of reclaimed water for certain applications that formerly used potable water at the wastewater treatment plants. The policy should be modified to reflect this implementation, as well as the County's participation in Pilot Projects under the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan that are also exploring the utilization of wastewater reuse as a way to augment water flows to Biscayne Bay and also to meet the demands for: (1) the Bird Drive Recharge Area; (2) the South Dade Conveyance System, and (3) the Northeast Shark River Slough.

Proposed Revisions to the Monitoring Program

The Monitoring Program for the Water and Sewer Subelement includes some monitoring measures that have become outdated or otherwise do not ensure reliable analysis of the

achievement of the objective. It is recommended that the following monitoring measures be changed.

Objective 4. The 2000 Census deleted a previously-asked question about how wastewater was disposed of by households, whether by septic tank, sanitary sewer, or other means. The Miami-Dade Health Department, which is in charge of issuing permits for septic tanks, both permits for new septic tanks and for abandoning septic tank systems, does not keep track of how many septic tank are still in operation. The Health Department can, however, provide information as to how many permits are for new systems and how many are for abandonments. By the time of the next EAR, the data as to the number of septic tanks existing in the County, from the 1990 Census, will be approximately 20 years old, and extrapolation from septic tank permit issuance would likely yield inaccurate information. It is therefore suggested that the monitoring measure instead be the proportion of septic tank permits issued that are for new septic tanks as opposed to septic tank abandonments.

Objective 5. This monitoring measure should be expanded to include the amount of water and wastewater, which is reused or reclaimed in the County. The narrative in future EAR documents should include an evaluation of reuse as a conservation measure.

4.2.5.2 Solid Waste Subelement

Conclusions

The evaluation and analysis of the goal, objectives, and policies of the Solid Waste Subelement leads to a conclusion that progress has been made in the provision of an integrated solid waste management system in conformity with applicable laws. Progress has been seen in this system's promotion of the public health, sanitation, environmental protection, operational efficiency, beneficial land use and growth patterns, and in creating and maintaining a fair and equitable funding mechanism. Miami-Dade County has succeeded in maintaining Level of Service (LOS) standards established at the date of adoption of the last Evaluation and Appraisal Report.

That progress has been made in achieving the objectives and policies under the goal is all the more impressive in light of changes that have occurred in the solid waste management industry over the past decade. These changes have come about due to citrus canker, economics of recycling and solid waste management, and uncertainties due to the *C & A Carbone, Inc. v. Clarkstown*, 511 U.S. 383 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1994 regarding "flow control" ordinances.

To strengthen the system in the face of this range of challenges, Miami-Dade County has had to rely on responsible business practices to provide efficient and effective solid waste collection and disposal operations in order to compete with the private sector. The County nevertheless demonstrated the ability to provide capacity for solid waste disposal throughout the County's own facilities within Miami-Dade County or by contract with other entities, sometimes outside the County, on an on-going basis.

Proposed Revisions to Solid Waste Objectives and Policies

Objective 1A. Other than Policy 1A, all policies are still relevant and require no modifications.

Policy 1A. The policy refers to where provision of solid waste management services will be provided, including disposal facilities and collection services. Since collection service is not a capital expenditure, is generally not cited as one of the urban services inducing further urban development, and is provided to protect the public health and welfare, including the environment, it is proposed that solid waste collection services be eliminated from this policy.

Objective 2. The policies under this objective are all relevant. The policies and monitoring measures under the objective implement Level of Service (LOS) standards for solid waste management. The objective directs that the County implement procedures for correcting what are perceived as solid waste facility deficiencies. However, the policies under this objective define and implement Level of Service standards, which in turn are defined as maintaining adequate disposal capacity. The objective does not explicitly refer to the LOS. As a result, it is suggested that the objective be clarified to specifically state the intention of the County to maintain adequate disposal capacity as defined in the LOS, and that any deficiencies refer to systemwide disposal capacity rather than individual facility capacity.

Policy 2A. The policy defines the Level of Service standard for the solid waste management system, and directs the County to maintain solid waste disposal capacity sufficient to accommodate waste flows for a minimum of 5 years. The policy notes that capacity includes both County-owned facilities and those operated under contract with the County. However, the policy does not explicitly state that such accommodation for 5 years is the Level of Service standard, and this should be clarified.

Policy 2B. This policy addresses the County's concurrency policy as it relates to solid waste disposal (LOS). It does so, however, in reference to specific waste facilities and the geographic area surrounding those facilities, while LOS and capacity are evaluated on a systemwide basis. The language should be revised to correct this discrepancy.

Objective 3. The analysis for Objective 2 notes that capacity for the County Solid Waste Management System includes both County-provided facilities as well as those operated under contract with the County. Therefore, maintaining an adequate LOS does not necessarily and is increasingly unlikely to depend upon implementation of projects listed in the Capital Improvements Element. The policies under the objective are all relevant, but if the objective itself is deleted, then the policies should be placed under Objective 2. Policy 3A.3 may require modification, under the expanded Objective 2.

Policy 3A.3. This policy calls for solid waste system improvements to be funded in accordance with a criterion to enable or encourage use by Miami-Dade County of products made from recycled materials. Since the Department of Solid Waste Management has little involvement in County procurement activities this criterion should be revised to focus on DSWM facility improvements that promote recycling or reuse of materials prior to disposal.

Policy 3D. This policy calls for the equitable sharing in the cost of providing solid waste management services. However, the policy language focuses on proposed development in contrast to existing development. The reverse case is also important in terms of equity. Taxpayers should not be expected to subsidize direct service delivery to solid waste system customers, nor should system users be expected to subsidize those solid waste services that benefit the general community. All beneficiaries of solid waste services, most particularly those that accrue to the general community, such as illegal dumping clean-up, waste-related enforcement, storm-related debris management activities, should share equitably in the cost of receiving the service.

Objective 4. Policies under this objective direct the management of solid waste in a manner that maintains environmental quality and community quality of life. The policies under this objective are still relevant, although modifications may be appropriate for Policy 4B and 4E.

Policy 4B. The directive to reduce disposal through increased reliance on recycling programs should be modified to delete a mandated increased reliance on recycling programs and toward a more flexible response, referring instead to an increase in recycling and alternative technologies.

Policy 4E. The policy directs minimization of the amount of yard trash disposed of in landfills and refers to several strategies. One such strategy, yard trash mulching, has been de-emphasized due to citrus canker concerns and the potential that mulching may spread the disease. Less emphasis should be placed on yard waste in favor of generic strategies covering a broader category of biodegradable wastes. The policy should be expanded to encourage other opportunities for reducing the volume of waste requiring disposal, through diversion and composting of biodegradable materials other than yard waste.

Objective 5. Objective 5 appears overly encompassing and broad in its reference to an integrated solid waste disposal system, and difficulties were encountered in monitoring. In response, it is proposed that a new Policy 5D be added, that refers to “equitable and responsible financing.”

Policy 5B. Policy 5B should be considered for deletion.

Policy 5D. This new policy should refer to equitable and responsible financing of disposal system costs, to be met through a combination of user fees, environmental protection fees, and capacity-related fees, without County general fund subsidy. The exception would be when the solid waste services provide a corresponding benefit to the general community, rather than exclusively or principally to the solid waste systems users paying the fees, in which case the general community should fund the cost.

Proposed Revisions to Solid Waste Monitoring Measures

Objective 1. Identification of solid waste disposal sites or fixed capital assets such as Landfills or Trash & Recycling Centers located outside the Urban Development Boundary (UDB); number and/or percentage of special collection events such as Household Hazardous Waste collections conducted outside of the UDB.

Objective 2. The achievement of the LOS standards are their own monitoring measures. For the entire objective, the following measures are recommended: annual amount of waste disposed of through the County disposal system in comparison with the capacity analysis of County disposal facilities prepared by the DSWM; per capita waste generation. Because this information is monitored in the course of routine operations by the County's solid waste management department, no alternative measures are proposed.

Objective 3. If the policies under this objective are moved to Objective 2, then these monitoring measures should also be listed under that objective. Identification and value of solid waste management capital projects, including source of funding, listed in the Miami-Dade County Capital Budget and in the CIE.

Objective 4 (new Objective 3). Use of the solid waste management system to promote environmental quality and community quality of life.

The measurements recommended are: quantity of each major class of waste product recycled within the County; quantity of compost and/or mulching products generated by the waste system, or explanation of reasons not to do so, such as danger of the spread of citrus canker; quantity of products purchased by the County and its departments containing recycled material; energy created through the incineration of waste derived fuel. Alternative or additional measurements include: quantity or proportion of the County waste stream diverted from landfilling through recycling, composting, resources recovery, and alternative packaging; illegal dumping tonnage collected by the County in total and on a per capita basis.

Objective 4 New Policy. A new measure of CO₂ reduction (as measured by DERM reporting) should be added to the existing measures of amount of waste recycled and the amount converted to energy.

Objective 5 (new Objective 4). The measurements recommended are: 1) the relative amounts of waste managed through recycling, incineration, and landfilling, by both the public and private sectors, be used as a measure of the level of "integration" of the solid waste management system; 2) relative amounts of funding, provided by user fees, environmental fees, and capacity-related fees, as a measure of financing equity; 3) solid waste management operating budget schedule of revenues and expenses for disposal systems (available in solid waste management department annual financial report).

Objective 6 (new Objective 5). Modify to retain measure of amounts of hazardous wastes collected and number of patrons served at collection sites, but with acknowledgement of new locations such as the "Permanent Center" or satellite sites (including Trash & Recycling Centers) or special collection events.

4.2.6 Recreation and Open Space Element

Conclusions

The primary conclusion arising from the evaluation and analysis of the goal, objectives, and policies of the Recreation and Open Space Element is that great progress has been made in the development, programming, and maintenance of a comprehensive system of parks and recreational spaces. Further, that these parks and recreational spaces provide good quality and diverse recreational experiences, and that valuable, natural, historical, and cultural resources are being preserved and protected. This conclusion is warranted from achievement of the Level of Service (LOS) standards established at the date of adoption of the last Evaluation and Appraisal Report, and progress made toward achieving the objectives and policies that guide the County in its provision of recreation and open space locations, facilities, and services.

It is further concluded that Miami-Dade County and its recreation and open space providers have positioned the County well for the changes occurring in, and challenges facing, Miami-Dade County government. The Safe Neighborhoods Parks bond issue of 1996 provided a dedicated source of \$200,000,000 in funding that has provided substantial benefit toward the provision of recreation and open space land and facilities, both to the County and the municipalities. Capital improvements projects have been funded with \$141,470,000 from bond proceeds and an additional \$9,446,000 in bond interest earnings has been awarded for land acquisition, as of April 30, 2003. The County has greatly improved its standing in achieving LOS, especially with regard to obtaining the needed acreage for an expanding population, although providing facilities for those parks necessarily lags.

Although a new Parks Master Plan is still to be completed, the Park and Recreation Department (PARD) has nonetheless completed other studies that have helped provide continued direction in the provision of recreation and open space activities and facilities. These studies include, for example, periodic leisure interest surveys, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Action Plan (1997), and participation in the County's Strategic Planning process since 2001. These activities have helped position PARD to be able to be responsive to the community and reorient resources as appropriate. What continues to challenge, however, is how to provide services and facilities to an increasingly diverse community that is identifying new needs and demanding more from the County as a service provider. The services and facilities have also become more important as the County is increasingly more developed, with greater residential density and infill taking place, and yet more recreational choices are available from both the County and the private sector.

Proposed Revisions

Objective 1. Target date will be changed from 2005 to 2010. Other than Policy 1B, all policies are still relevant and require no changes as identified.

Policy 1B. The policy should be retained, but reference to the State Board of Regents should be changed, reflecting changes in Florida Statutes and the State Constitution, to refer to public

college and university boards of trustees, which is a more inclusive term that would include the Board of Regents.

Objective 2. Target date will be changed from 2005 to 2010. The policies under the objective are all relevant but may warrant modification, including how Level of Service is defined.

Policy 2A. Under Policy 2A.ii., a local recreation open space of 5 acres or larger within 3-1/2 miles from a residential development is listed as a minimum standard. This has been part of LOS since at least 1988. Population has increased in the County since that time, as has traffic congestion. Especially with the additions to the inventory of parks and open spaces cited above, most areas are within that 3-1/2 mile standard. However, striving for better service and facility provision is not unwarranted. National standards list a range of from 0.5 to 3 miles as the distance to travel to a community park of more than 20 acres, or 0.5 miles to neighborhood parks of at least 5 acres. The local open space standard needs to be reviewed with regard to residential densities. A reduction in the 3-1/2 mile standard, or a reference to a time-based standard in addition, would not be inconsistent with the above discussion.

Policy 2B. The section of the policy which calls upon the County to increase its proportionate share of the local parks supply appears inconsistent with those under Objective 4 that look to increased partnerships with other agencies and organizations for service and facility provision. This segment should be further examined with consideration given to elimination.

Objective 3. Target date will be changed from 2000 to 2010. All of the policies under the objective are still relevant. However, inasmuch as the policy is concerned with access to park and recreational facilities and as such does involve capital financing and/or provision of park and recreation open spaces and facilities, the objective and policies may be considered for inclusion under Objective 4.

Objective 4. The policies under this objective are still relevant but may warrant modification, and policies included under Objective 3 may be appropriate to be placed under this objective.

Policy 4E. This policy has been substantially accomplished, with passage of the Safe Neighborhood Parks bond issue of 1996. Implementation, however, has been ongoing since that time and continues, with another 30 percent of the bond proceeds still to be disbursed as of April 30, 2003. Policy implementation is therefore still relevant and modification of the policy would be warranted.

Policy 4F. This policy appears irrelevant. While the intent appears appropriate, the means to accomplish the policy – that other non-recreation oriented County department participate – was not included. The policy should be modified to call for recreation and open space provider agencies to solicit the interest of other County agencies in participating in the provision of parks and recreation programs and assist with the implementation of ROS Element policies.

Policy 4G. The policy is still relevant and has not been accomplished. Target date for completing a new Recreation Open Space Master Plan should be changed from 2000 to 2010,

and the date for the planning horizon of the Plan should be extended from 2015, as currently directed, to 15 years after adoption, e.g. a new Plan adopted in 2005 would extend to 2020.

4.2.7 Coastal Management Element

Conclusions

An evaluation and analysis of the objectives contained in the Coastal Management Element indicates that the County has been proactive in preserving and enhancing coastal resources. This is reflected through the achievement of conserving, enhancing and restoring coastal wetlands, beaches, artificial reefs and other coastal resources as directed by Objectives 1, 2 and 4 of the element. Additionally, surface water quality in the canals and bay has been significantly improved between 1995 and 2002, and several programs have been implemented to continue this enhancement as directed in Objective 3. However, since antidegradation targets have not been established between the FDEP and the County, additional work is necessary to for full achievement of this objective.

Objectives 5 and 6 of this element are directed towards increasing the amount of water related and dependent uses along the shoreline, preserving traditional uses, and minimizing construction impacts along the coast. Both of these objectives have been achieved between 1995 and 2002, through permitting and review programs established by the County. Due to the extensive coordination, which occurs prior to approval, shoreline accessibility was increased and user conflicts were minimized. Unfortunately, application and permitting data do not adequately reflect the efforts of the county to accomplish these goals.

Miami-Dade County conducts extensive public participation programs in the areas of resource education and has easily achieved Objective 7.

Objectives 8 through 12, relating to disaster planning, hazard mitigation and post-disaster recovery, have all been achieved over the previous seven-year period. Miami-Dade County through its planning approach and the creation of the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) is considered a leader in the Emergency Management. The County has spearheaded efforts to reduce losses due to natural disasters through funding of pre-disaster programs, implementation of advanced technologies and warning systems, and extensive agency and community coordination. These policies continue to provide a sound foundation for pre- and post-disaster planning.

Proposed Revisions to the Coastal Management Element

Figure 1. This figure will be revised to show the most current Hurricane Evacuation Areas

Policy 1A. This policy should be updated to include new mangrove wetland areas and clarify the wording in the policy. This policy should be updated to include additional wetland areas.

Policy 1G. This policy should be updated to include additional wetland areas, which prohibit dredging and filling activities.

Objective 1 Monitoring Measure. The word “program” should be deleted from the text.

Objective 3. This objective should be rephrased to continually encourage a reduction in water quality exceedances. A year and percentage should be removed.

Policy 3C. This policy should be reworded to continue the prioritization and improvements to damaged storm water outfalls. Implementation dates and percentages should be removed or modified and the policy should be modified to be dynamic.

Policy 3H. The generation quantity should be changed from 50 to 55 gallons.

Policy 3I. This policy should be reworded to provide for continued compliance with the Best Management Practices for marina and dock facilities.

Policy 3J. This policy should be modified to reflect the status of pumpout facility requirements.

Policy 3P. This policy should be reworded to set a new target date for the development of antidegradation targets.

Objective 3 Monitoring Measure. This measure should be reworded to set a new target date for the development of antidegradation targets.

Objective 4. This objective should be rephrased to become more dynamic. The Objective should not be year specific or acreage specific.

Policy 4D. This policy should be rewritten to seek funding for the study or removal of invasive plant and animal species along the coast. This policy will not be year specific since it has been identified that these invasive plants and animals are a continuing problem.

Objective 4 Monitoring Measure. The word “new” should be deleted from this monitoring measure.

Objective 5. This objective should be reworded to become more dynamic and should not be year specific.

Policy 5D. Should be expanded to recommend that compliance processes for required mitigation be developed by the Shoreline Development Review Committee.

Policy 6A. A new date for funding should be provided since this effort is considered necessary and has not yet been accomplished.

Objective 8. This objective should be rewritten to reflect an increase in sheltering capacity but should not be year or percentage specific.

Policy 8A. This policy should be reworded to reflect the name of the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.

Policy 8K. This policy should be reworded to reflect the new evacuation strategy and not be year specific.

Objective 8 Monitoring Measure. This measure should be clarified to reflect new evacuation measurements.

Objective 9. This objective should be made an on-going policy and not be year specific.

Policy 10A. This policy should be reworded to provide for a new date for the Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan and should refer to the Hazard Mitigation Plan as the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.

Objective 10 Monitoring Measure. This monitoring measure should be reworded to evaluate the impact of the “After Action Reports” prepared by OEM and indicate the changes in policy and funding to prepare for future storms.

Objective 11. This objective should be reworded to reflect name change in the Hazard Mitigation and Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan.

Policy 11A. This policy should be reworded to reflect the correct name of the plans to be implemented after a hurricane.

Policy 11C. This policy should be reworded to eliminate the South Florida Building Code and replace it with the High Velocity Hurricane Zone portion of the Florida Building Code.

Objective 11 Monitoring Measure. This monitoring measure is vague and should be rewritten to include the accomplishments of the LMS.

Objective 12. This objective should be made an on-going policy and not be year specific.

Objective 12 Monitoring Measure. A second monitoring measure should be added to track the increase in the number of historic and archeological sites located in the Coastal Area.

4.2.8 Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Conclusions

The previous Evaluation and Appraisal Report required numerous revisions to this element. Additionally, in 1999, the Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning Department filed an application requesting amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element in order to comply with changes to by Section 163.3177(6)(h), Florida Statutes. The changes and reasons for the changes are as follows: 1) A new Policy 3B to address the DCA objection that the CDMP did not currently contain provisions addressing joint planning areas for municipal incorporations; 2) modification of Policy 3F to address the DCA objection that CDMP did not have policies regarding collaborative planning and decision making on siting facilities of countywide significance and locally unwanted land uses, especially within municipalities; and 3) modification of Policies 1G and 7B, and the adding of new Policies 5C and 5D to address the DCA objection that the CDMP did not contain adequate policies addressing coordination with the adjacent counties of Broward, Monroe and Collier;

A review of Intergovernmental Coordination Element indicates that the objectives have been met and that Miami-Dade County has made significant strides in coordination between local, regional, state and federal agencies. The establishment of CERP has increased the need for coordination between the County and the participating agencies.

Proposed Revisions

Policy 1C. This policy should be modified to acknowledge formation of a planning technical committee of Miami-Dade local governments and continued participation in the committee.

Policy 1S. This policy should be modified to conform to the state mandated Interlocal Agreement executed in February 2003 by Miami-Dade County, other local governments and the Miami-Dade County Public School System, pursuant to Section 1013.33, Florida Statutes.

Policy 4D. This policy should be reworded to reflect the CERP efforts and not be restricted to the East Everglades.

Objective 4 Monitoring Measure. The monitoring measure should be revised to include the participation between the County and CERP and State projects.

Policy 5B. This policy should be rephrased to acknowledge the cooperation between the County and the South Florida Water Management District with regard to regional programs and County plans and programs. Wording should also incorporate CERP coordination.

Policy 5C. This policy should be updated to include current programs.

Objective 5 Monitoring Measure. This monitoring measure should be rephrased to incorporate CERP since the Surface Water Management Plan has been incorporated into various CERP and other Water Management District Programs.

4.2.9 Capital Improvements Element

Conclusions

In general, the CIE has served its purpose over the past eight years. It has caused the operating departments that are affected by its provisions to be more aware of CDMP planning objectives. The extra scrutiny afforded by the CIE has also probably made them more fiscally responsible and more attentive to priority setting. For the most part, all objectives have been met and all should be retained as they are. Only two policies require modest changes and new monitoring measures are necessary for all objectives.

Proposed Revisions

Policy 1F. The intent of Policy 1F, finding more funding sources, is still valid but the approach needs to be changed and therefore this policy should be rewritten.

Objective 1 Monitoring Measure. Objective 1 will be evaluated through the use of information compiled in the annual CIE Summary Table.

Objective 2 Monitoring Measure. Objective 2 will be monitored by checking development records.

Objective 3 Monitoring Measure. Concurrency records will be utilized to monitor and evaluate Objective 3.

Objective 4 Monitoring Measure. For each CIE category, the dollar ratio of unfunded projects to the total of both funded and unfunded projects will be tracked and will serve to measure progress on Objective 4.

Policy 5B. Policy 5B should be revised to remove the reference to “fiscal planning” and substitute a brief description of the process by which the second part of Objective 5 is carried out.

Objective 5 Monitoring Measure. Objective 5 is basically a regulation, which is controlled by certain processes. These processes consist of the master functional plans from operational departments, the CDMP amendment cycles, the Development Impact Committee reviews, and the preparation of the Capital Improvements Element. Future monitoring of this objective will continue to rely on results of these activities.

4.2.10 Educational Element

Conclusions

This section of the element evaluation presents a summary of general conclusions and identifies needed actions and/or proposed plan amendments to address or implement identified changes as discussed in other sections of this report. Proposed revisions may include the identification of new and revised goals, objectives and policies, revised future condition maps, capital improvement schedules and monitoring and evaluation procedures. While actual proposed amendment languages is not include, the general natures or types of changes are clearly described. All proposed revisions presented here have been carefully linked to the evaluation of current conditions within the County, objective achievement, issues, problems and opportunities and other sections of this element report.

Proposed Revisions

The following policies should be considered for modification. The numbering of the policies in this element will be modified to be consistent with the other elements.

Objective 1 should be modified to reflect a change to the MDCPS FISH capacity standard replacing the “enhanced programmed capacity”, and extend the desired outcome dates to 2015 and 2025.

Policy 1.6. This policy should be modified to correct the Florida Statutes reference to Section 1013.33, Florida Statutes and reference the adopted School Interlocal Agreement.

Policy 1.7. This policy should be modified to provide for utilizing enrollment projections based on demographic, revenue, and education estimating conferences pursuant to Section 216.136, Florida Statutes, as modified by the School Board pursuant to development data and agreement with the local governments and Office of Education Facilities and SMART Schools Clearinghouse. The School Board will also continue to coordinate with the cities and the county regarding developments trends and future population projections.

Policy 6.5. This policy should be revised to take into account the terms in the Interlocal Agreement that requires the School Board and the County to annually review the Educational Facilities Impact Fee methodology, its formula and technical report, in order to make recommendations for revision to the Board of County Commissioners.

4.3 ASSESSMENT OF SPECIAL TOPICS

4.3.2 Evaluation of Redevelopment in Coastal High Hazard Areas and Hazard Mitigation Strategies

Conclusions

During an assessment of redevelopment in the CHHA and the potential impairment of property rights from lowed densities, it was determined that only four of the areas of unincorporated Miami-Dade County were within this area. Of these, three two areas were public beaches, environmentally protected parks or institutional uses and the fourth area was a high density residential community in which redevelopment has not occurred. This evaluation further determined that current CDMP policies adequately address redevelopment in the CHHA. A revision to the definition of the CHHA is believed to be necessary to accommodate new evacuation zones associated with Evacuation Zone A (Category 1 Hurricane).

The hazard mitigation plan for Miami-Dade County is incorporated into the LMS. A review of the goals and objectives of this plan indicate that it is consistent with the federal, state and local policies, which deal with hazard mitigation. No additional policies are recommended for the LMS at this time, however, several policy revisions are referenced in section 2.7 Coastal Management Element of the EAR, which should provide a linkage between the CEMP, LMS and CDMP.

Proposed Revisions

The following revision is proposed for the Capital Improvement Element as follows.

Policy 2C. This policy should be updated to clarify that the CHHA refers to only the barrier islands of the County. Recent modifications to the Evacuation Zones within the County indicate that the Category 1 Hurricane boundary (now referred to as Zone A) includes a western area which is considered inaccessible due to heavy rainfall. This area is not a portion of the CHHA and should be excluded from the CHHA definition except as it applies to evacuations.

4.3.3 Effects of Statutes and Rule Changes

Conclusions

An evaluation of consistency between the adopted comprehensive plan with relevant changes to the state growth management policies indicates that the CDMP is consistent with Section 187.02, F.S., the State Comprehensive Plan and the Strategic Regional Plan for South Florida. Although the evaluation of and Chapter 163, Part II, F.S. and Rule 9J-5 F.A.C. indicated that most revisions were either administrative or had been addressed, some inconsistencies were revealed. The following EAR-based revisions are proposed to bring the CDMP into compliance with the applicable state regulations.

Proposed Revisions

1. An amendment to the CDMP Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element should be proposed to address the requirements of Subsection 163.3177(6)(d), F.S. which states:

“...Local governments shall assess their current, as well as projected, water needs and sources for at least a 10-year period, considering the appropriate regional water supply plan ...”
2. An amendment to the CDMP Intergovernmental Coordination Element should be proposed to address the requirements of Subsection 163.3177(6)(h)1, F.S. which states:

“An intergovernmental coordination element showing relationships and stating principles and guidelines to be used in the accomplishment of coordination of the adopted comprehensive plan with the plans of ... the applicable regional water supply...”
3. New policies or maps, or modifications to existing policies or maps should be proposed to the appropriate subelement of the Transportation Element to comply with various inconsistencies found through an evaluation of 9J-5 F.A.C. These include the following.
4. Coordinate the siting of new, or expansion of existing, ports, airports, or related facilities with the future land use, coastal management, and conservation elements
5. Coordinate the surface transportation access to ports, airports, or related facilities with the traffic circulation system shown on the traffic circulation maps or map series;
6. Coordinate with any ports, airports, or related facilities plans of the appropriate ports, airports or related facilities provider, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Federal Aviation Administration, metropolitan planning organization, military services, or resource planning and management plan prepared pursuant to Chapter 380, F.S., and approved by the Governor and Cabinet, the Florida Department of Transportation 5-Year transportation Plan, and Continuing Florida Aviation System Planning Process as adopted; and
7. Ensure that access routes to ports, airports, or related facilities are properly integrated with other modes of surface or water transportation.
8. For multimodal transportation districts established pursuant to Section 163.3180(15)(a) and (b), F.S., provide for a safe, comfortable and attractive pedestrian environment with convenient interconnection to public transportation.
9. Provision of safe and convenient on-site traffic flow, considering needed motorized and non-motorized vehicle parking

- 10 Promotion of ports, airports, and related facilities development and expansion consistent with the future land use, coastal management, and conservation elements;
- 11 Mitigation of adverse structural and non-structural impacts from ports, airports, or related facilities upon adjacent natural resources and land uses;
- 12 Protection and conservation of natural resources within ports, airports and related facilities;
- 13 Coordinated intermodal management of surface and water transportation within ports, airports and related facilities; and
- 14 Protection of ports, airports, or related facilities from the encroachment of incompatible land uses.
- 15 An amendment to the CDMP Educational Element should be proposed to address the requirements of Subsection 163.31776, F.S.